



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

118

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| 09/410,368 | 09/30/99 | HAVENS | J 244/006 |

LYON & LYON LLP
633 W FIFTH ST
SUITE 4700
LOS ANGELES CA 90071

HM22/1213

EXAMINER

MARSCHEL, A

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

1631

DATE MAILED:

4
12/13/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/410,368

Applicant(s)

Havens et al.

Examiner

Ardin Marschel

Group Art Unit

1631



☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 1 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 1-66 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☒ Claims 1-66 are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s) _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

The art unit designated for this application has changed. Applicant(s) are hereby informed that future correspondence should be directed to Art Unit 1631.

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. § 121:

I. Claims 1-39, drawn to microarrays with a permeation layer, classified in Class 422, subclass 68.1. If this Group is elected, then the below summarized specie election is also required.

II. Claims 40-66, drawn to methods of making a microarray of biomolecules, classified in Class 530, subclass 333, and Class 536, subclass 25.3.

Specie election requirement regarding above Group I:

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

Specie A: microarrays with a permeation layer onto which the P-X-R group is attached: - Claims 1-40

Specie B: microarrays with a permeation layer without a P-X-R attachment limitation: - Claims 1-13

The above species are distinct because a different and separate search for each specie would be required thus supporting the undue search burden if these species were to be searched together versus separately. For example, it is noted that sample preparatory practice frequently includes some type of permeation

filtering to remove large particles which would clog and/or obscure biomolecular reactions such as binding reactions as would be most commonly practiced with the instantly claimed microarrays. Such permeation filtering is commonly separate from the binding device location or, alternatively, placed over the device without any connection to the actual binding reaction components. Thus, the instant claims directed to a permeation layer practice wherein the binding reaction components are actually connected to the permeation layer is a distinct concept which clearly would require a separate search over the generic permeation layer type of invention thus further supporting this specie election requirement based on Species A and B as given above.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. § 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1-13 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a response to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 C.F.R. § 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. M.P.E.P. § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 of the other invention.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

The distinctness of Species A versus B of Group I has already been explained above.

The inventions of Group II and Group I are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (M.P.E.P. § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the microarrays of Group I may be made by the distinct process of derivatizing the microchip substrate separately by the sequential attachment of each of the moieties to be attached thereon. For example, 1) permeation layer, 2) P moiety, 3) X moiety, 4) R moiety, and, lastly and optionally, the desired biomolecule rather than P-X-R all in one attachment reaction as a unit. The building up of a layered device by the separate formation of layers of moieties on substrates is a very common preparatory technique which is distinct from the method claimed in Group II.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the response to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR § 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a diligently-filed petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(h).

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technical Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technical Center 1600 via the PTO Fax Center located in Crystal Mall 1. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1988), 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993), and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993) (See 37 CFR § 1.6(d)). The CM1 Fax Center number is either (703) 308-4242 or (703) 305-3014.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ardin Marschel, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (703) 308-3894. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8 A.M. to 4 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Woodward, can be

Serial No. 09/410,368


- 6 -

Art Unit: 1631

reached on (703) 308-4028.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to Patent Analyst, Tina Plunkett, whose telephone number is (703)305-3524 or to the Technical Center receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

December 11, 2000


ARDIN H. MARSCHER
PRIMARY EXAMINER